

'The future may not be that rosy'

Arthur J. Snider paints a glowing picture of the technological blessings that the 1970s will bring. But has he given some serious thought to the probable social consequences of some of these "blessings"?

The basic problem is that as our society becomes more and more tightly organized and technological, the power to make the decisions that influence the daily life of each individual becomes more and more concentrated in the hands of scientists and those who hire them. The individual has less and less ability to make the important decisions for himself and choose his own style of living.

I would also like to point out that, even from a strictly materialistic viewpoint, many scientists feel that the future looks far less rosy than is indicated in your articles on the 1970s.

For example, some scientists predict that in 10 or 15 years air pollution will be so bad that we will need a "semispace suit" to go outdoors. "We have no solution" to the problem, they add.

David Lyle, in a 1967 article in *Esquire*, reported that many responsible authorities hold an extremely gloomy view of the future because of the population explosion and environmental deterioration. One of them said, "We are coming to a situation in which the optimist will be the man who thinks that present living standards can be maintained."

Why should we continue to donate our tax money to the technologists through federal research grants so that they can use us as pawns in their game of "progress"?

Lombard THEODORE J. KACZYNSKI